Application No.: 10/535,221

Amendment Dated February 11, 2009 Reply to Office Action of November 19, 2008

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-16 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended. Accordingly, claims 1-16 are presented for reconsideration.

Claims 1-5, 10-11 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (b) as being anticipated by Hattori. Claim 1 is amended to recite features neither disclosed nor suggested by the prior art, namely:

- ... a support supporting the top plate from underneath, the support including a top plate-supporting face contacting the top plate, and a cooker-supporting face contacting a cabinet ...
- \dots a frame constituting a cooker body, the frame having a flange disposed over the cabinet \dots
- ... wherein the support has the cooker-supporting face, the cooker-supporting face being positioned outside of the top plate-supporting face and the flange. (Emphasis added).

Basis for the amendment may be found, for example, at page 6, lines 16-17 and 22-24, page 9, lines 14-15 and Fig. 10 of the originally filed application.

Applicants have attached a copy of Applicants' Fig. 10 with markings (Exhibit A) to assist with the explanation. Exhibit A is being used for illustrative purposes only. Applicants' exemplary embodiment shown at Fig. 10 includes a support 12. Support 12 includes a top plate-supporting face 13 and a cooker supporting face 17. Top plate-supporting face 13 contacts top plate 11 and supports top plate 11 from underneath top plate 11. Frame 16 includes a flange 22 disposed over cabinet 18. Cooker-supporting face 17 contacts cabinet 18 at a position outside of both top plate support 13 and a flange 22 of frame 16. Thus, claim 1 recites "... a support supporting the top plate from underneath, the support including ... a cooker-supporting face contacting a cabinet ..." and "... the cooker-supporting face being positioned outside of the top plate-supporting face and the flange."

Hattori discloses a built-in heating cooker which comprises (a) a main body 11 including a first flange 13 (flange) contacting an assembly bed 12 (cabinet) and (b) a connecting part 19 contacting a top plate 16 (top plate) for supporting the top plate

Application No.: 10/535,221 Amendment Dated February 11, 2009

Reply to Office Action of November 19, 2008

being connected to the main body 11 at inside of the first flange 13 (flange). Cooling air passes through a hole 19-1 of the connecting part 19, and exits from an internal space located between the first flange 13 and top plate frame 17 (frame). Hattori, however, fails to disclose or suggest that the connecting part 19 supports the top plate 16 (top plate) by contacting the assembly bed 12 (cabinet) at a position outside of the first flange 13 (flange). That is, Hattori fails to disclose or suggest "... a support supporting the top plate from underneath, the support including ... a cooker-supporting face contacting a cabinet ..." and "... the cooker-supporting face being positioned outside of the top plate-supporting face and the flange," as recited in claim 1.

Applicants' claimed features are advantageous over the prior art because (1) the supporting-strength for top plate is improved by cooker-supporting face 17 supporting top plate 11 and contacting cabinet 18, (2) sealing against leakage of water to the inside of the cooker is improved, and (3) a frame works as a first prevention against an entry of water inside the cooker and also protects top plate 11 by covering it.

Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the art of record. Claims 2-5, 10-11 and 13 ultimately depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 10-11 and 13 are likewise allowable over the art of record.

Claims 6-9, 12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being obvious over Hattori in view of Cobb. Cobb is cited for its teaching of a sealing material on the bottom face of a cooker. Cobb does not make up for the deficiencies of Hattori, as described above with respect to claim 1. Claims 6-9, 12 and 14-16 ultimately depend from claim 1. Accordingly, claims 6-9, 12 and 14-16 are also allowable because they ultimately depend from allowable claim 1.

Application No.: 10/535,221

Amendment Dated February 11, 2009

Reply to Office Action of November 19, 2008

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this Application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738

Attorney for Applicants

JLE/dmw

Enclosure: A copy of Applicants' Fig. 10 with markings (Exhibit A)

Dated: February 11, 2009

P.O. Box 980 Valley Forge, PA 19482 (610) 407-0700

NM375423

EXHIBIT A DO NOTENTER"

^{8/9} FIG. 10

